

41



PATENT

New Attorney Docket No. 544342000100

Old Attorney Docket No. 067177.0103

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants: Mark Turcotte )  
 )  
Appl. No.: 09/708,709 ) Group Art Unit: 1744  
 )  
Filing Date: Nov. 9, 2000 ) Examiner: Krisanne Marie Thornton

Title: ULTRAVIOLET AIR PURIFICATION SYSTEMS

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

**RECEIVED**

**DEC 10 2003**

**TC 1700**

Sir:

**REQUEST TO WITHDRAW OFFICE ACTION AS INCOMPLETE**

Applicant respectfully requests that the presently pending Office Action be withdrawn as incomplete and a new Office Action be issued. The details of this matter are as follows.

Applicant received an Office Action (Paper No. 7) from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, mail dated September 9, 2003, regarding the above-identified patent application. In that Action was included a properly initialed PTO Form 1449, acknowledging the examiner's review and consideration of certain references cited by applicant, and also a copy of PTO Form 892, which identified certain references cited by the examiner and copies of the indicated references. No other PTO Forms or other documents were enclosed or attached.

In the Detailed Action section of the Office Action, the examiner states that "[n]ew corrected drawings are required in this application because those filed with the application are informal" (*emphasis added*, Paper No. 7, page 2, first paragraph). Further, the examiner ends that paragraph with the statements that:

"The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance." (Paper No. 7, page 2, first paragraph)

Upon reviewing these statements the undersigned contacted Examiner Thornton by telephone on or about September 13, 2003. First, applicant noted that the drawings filed were not filed informally, but were indeed formal drawings. The examiner responded that appropriate corrections were nevertheless required. Second, the undersigned noted that no drawing corrections are identified either in the Office Action and that there was no Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review or other similar document included with the Office Action that would provide any information as to what applicant was supposed to correct. Further, the undersigned noted that the Office Action Summary did not have "Box 2" of the "Attachment(s)" section checked, thus indicating that no such Notice was even prepared. The examiner agreed and stated that applicant would receive PTO Form 948 shortly. The undersigned requested that the Form be sent by facsimile to expedite appropriate corrections.

To date no PTO Form 948 or any other document identifying what drawing corrections are required to respond to the Office Action has been received. Nevertheless, the three (3) month due date is now approaching.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the present Office Action (Paper No. 7) be withdrawn as incomplete for failure to provide information necessary to prepare a response and that a new, complete Office Action be issued as soon as possible.

If there are any fees due with the filing of this Request, including any fees for an extension of time, applicant respectfully requests that extension and also requests that any and all fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 03-1952.

Respectfully submitted,  
Morrison & Foerster LLP

Date: December 8, 2003

By

  
James Remenick  
Registration No. 36,902

Morrison & Foerster, LLP  
1650 Tyson's Blvd., Suite 300  
McLean, VA 22102  
(703) 760-7100 (telephone)  
(703) 760-7777 (telecopier)